

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly being unpatentable over Sasmazel et al., US 6,725,376 ("Sasmazel") in view of Limisco, US 6,662,228. Claims 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sasmazel in view of Muratov et al., US Publication No. 2003/0097596. Applicant traverses these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16 are allowable because the cited art fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Beginning with claim 11, Applicant recites "comparing the IP address of a received message against the list of IP addresses stored by the server." The Final Office Action never specifically addresses this feature with regard to the grounds of rejection for claim 11. Instead, the Final Office Action states that Sasmazel teaches a physical security system for processing IP address information in order to authenticate the client device in claims 1 and 4. This is simply not taught or suggested in Sasmazel. Claims 1 and 4 merely state that an eticket created by the authentication server of Sasmazel includes an IP address. There is no specific teaching, or even suggestion, of comparing the IP address of a received message against a list of IP addresses stored by the server to provide authentication. Instead, Sasmazel teaches away from using the IP address for authentication by specifically stating that authentication information includes, e.g., a "user ID and password" (see, e.g., column 8, lines 24-25). Nowhere does Sasmazel teach using

an IP address for authentication purposes. In fact, Sasmazel provides no discussion at all of why the IP address is even included in the eticket. However, one skilled in the art would recognize that the IP address is likely provided so that the authorization server can communicate directly back to the client/user to service a request by the end user, e.g., to provide content.

Note that Sasmazel teaches the use of two servers, an (1) authentication server that determines an identity of a user attempting to access a system (column 1, lines 57-58), and (2) an authorization server that determines what types of activities are permitted for an authenticated user (column, lines 304). As noted above, authentication by the (1) authentication server in Sasmazel is done via a name and password. Sasmazel neither teaches nor suggests using an IP address for authentication at the (1) authentication server. Any suggestion otherwise is without factual support. Authentication by the (2) authorization server is achieved by successfully decrypting the eticket. "If the hashing technique and public key operate to properly decrypt and rehash the eticket 310, then the information stored in the eticket 310 is determined to be valid." (See column 9, lines 18-20). Once the eticket is determined to be valid (i.e., authentic), then the (2) authorization server can extract the authorization level (see, e.g., column 7, lines 36-37) to determine if the user is authorized for a requested service (see, e.g., column 9, lines 35-49). Thus, neither the (1) authentication server nor the (2) authorization server of Samazel teaches or suggests using an IP address for authentication. And clearly, neither server includes a comparing process in which the user's IP address is compared to stored IP addresses.

Sasmazel's invention instead allows an authentication at a first server to be securely packaged in an eticket and sent to a second server in order to avoid having to manually re-authenticate the user at the second server. As noted, Applicant in claim 1 claims a single Internet server that provides both logical authentication (i.e., name and password) and physical

authentication (i.e., IP address analysis). It would be counterintuitive for Sasmazel to provide its eticket process in a single server environment such as Applicant's, since the whole purpose of Sasmazel's eticket is to provide secure access to information over a distributed computing environment, such as the web (see, e.g., Summary of the Invention). Nowhere does Sasmazel teach or suggest using both logical and physical authentication at a single server. As noted, the likely purpose of including the IP address in the eticket is so that the authorization server can communicate back to the user requesting a service. Limiso fails to remedy any of the above deficiencies, as Limiso likewise provides an environment that includes multiple servers.

Accordingly, for these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16 are allowable over the cited art. Claims 5 and 15 are believed allowable for similar reasons. Each of the claims not specifically addressed herein is believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as their own unique features. For instance, claim 2 recites "storing a list of each logged in user and a reference IP address collected during a login procedure" (and similarly claim 7). The Final Office Action alleges that this feature is taught in claims 1 and 4. However, nowhere does claim 1 or 4 teach storing a list. Claims 1 and 4 merely state that the IP address is included in the eticket, which is specifically encrypted for each user. Nowhere do the cited claims teach storing a *list* of IP addresses for each user logged into the server. Such a suggestion goes beyond any reasonable interpretation of the cited art.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No. 40,019

Dated: 12/11/07

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile